1		
2		
3		
4		
5	LIMITED STATES	DISTRICT COLIDT
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
7	CUDISTORIED DDICCS	CASE NO. C25 5052 DUC
8	CHRISTOPHER BRIGGS,	CASE NO. C25-5053 BHS
9	Plaintiff, v.	ORDER
10	LEGACY SALMON CREEK	
11	MEDICAL CENTER,	
12	Defendant.	
13	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Magistrate Judge Grady J. Leopold's	
14	Report and Recommendation (R&R), Dkt. 4, recommending the Court deny pro se	
15	plaintiff Christopher Briggs's application to proceed in forma pauperis, and dismiss this	
16	case with prejudice and without leave to amend.	
17	Briggs seeks to sue defendant Legacy Salmon Creek for violating his Health	
18	Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) rights by sharing his medical	
19	information, which it does under its Notice of Privacy Practices (NPP). Dkt. 1-1 at 7–8.	
20	Briggs claims Legacy refused to honor his "opt out request." Dkt. 1.	
21		
22		

1 The R&R concludes that there is no HIPAA private right of action, and that 2 Briggs's sole claim is fatally flawed. Dkt. 4 at 3 (citing Garmon v. County of Los 3 Angeles, 828 F.3d 837, 847 (9th Cir. 2016) ("HIPAA itself provides no private right of 4 action.")). 5 A district court "shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report 6 or specified proposed finding or recommendations to which objection is made." 28 7 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C); see also Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). It must modify or set aside any 8 portion of the order that is clearly erroneous or contrary to law. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(a). The 9 district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further 10 evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions. Fed. R. Civ. P. 11 72(b)(3). 12 The Court must "review the Magistrate Judge's findings and recommendations de 13 novo if objection is made, but not otherwise." United States v. Reyna-Tapia, 328 F.3d 14 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (citing § 636(b)(1)(C)). A proper objection requires "specific 15 written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations." Fed. R. Civ. P. 16 72(b)(2). 17 Briggs has not objected to the R&R, and it is neither clearly erroneous nor 18 contrary to law. It is **ADOPTED.** Briggs's application to proceed in forma pauperis is 19 **DENIED**, and this case is **DISMISSED** with prejudice and without leave to amend. 20 The Clerk shall enter a **JUDGMENT** and close the case. 21 IT IS SO ORDERED. 22 //

1	Dated this 10th day of February, 2025.
2	l $l$
3	
4	BENJAMIN H. SETTLE United States District Judge
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	